## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

## **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claim 1 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crossman et al. (US-3,887,187) in view of Cook et al. (US-5,382,022).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 2-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten or in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claim 2 is deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 2 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the claims 3-5 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Applicant

Feng-Yi Tien

58, MA YUAN WEST ST.,

TAICHUNG, TAIWAN

Aug. 12, 2004